



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1/21
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,513	06/27/2001	Paul D. Franke	1762-010921	4133
28289	7590	03/14/2006	EXAMINER	
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/869,513	FRANKE, PAUL D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	---

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/27/2005 has been entered.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-42 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-158 of copending Application No. 09/809595. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

5. "A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46

USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (Affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

7. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salesky et al. (6,343,313) (hereinafter Salesky).

8. As per claim 1, Salesky discloses method for conducting at least one convention, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating

(conference server 14, facilitates the exchange between, presenter client 12, and attendee clients 18(a)-(c)) the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client (convention means coming together, as a group of people meeting in one place, col 7, lines 1-4, fig 1, 18(a-c), 12) comprising the steps of:

- a. receiving (col 29, lines 62-63), from the at least one meeting planner client (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24), and electronically storing at a central website (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24), convention content (meeting content, col 24, lines 66-67) information for a plurality of conventions (col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings);
- b. receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client (17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (col 8, lines 34-45); and
- c. releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information (17,14, fig 2, col 8, lines 35-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference).

9. As per claim 2, Salesky discloses at least one meeting planner client is a plurality of meeting planner clients (col 30, lines 15-24 and col 8, lines 35-45).
10. As per claim 3, Salesky discloses at least one attendee client is a plurality of attendee clients (8, lines 35-45).
11. As per claim 4, Salesky discloses the convention content information is cyber-based (8, lines 35-45, WWW browser).
12. As per claim 5, Salesky discloses the convention content () information is one of either cyber-based or venue-based (8, lines 35-45, WWW browser).
13. As per claim 6, Salesky discloses the step of storing in a relational database cross-referencing fields from the meeting planner client to allow for the holding of an unlimited number of conventions (col 29, lines 34-41 and col 30, lines 15-30).
14. As per claim 7, Salesky discloses prior to step b); the steps of receiving at the central website a search request from the attendee client for certain convention content information and releasing to the attendee client

information satisfying the search request (17,14, fig 2, col 8, lines 35-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference).

15. As per claim 8, Salesky discloses the steps of receiving at the central website from the attendee client information necessary to register for the convention (col 8, lines 34-36, being told).

16. As per claim 9, Salesky discloses the step of using attendee client information to alert attendee clients of future conventions that may be of interest to them (col 8, lines 34-36, being told).

17. As per claim 10, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website, from at least one exhibitor client, convention search, selection and registration information for at least one convention (col 8, lines 30-35, presenter and attendee client, conference listing).

18. As per claim 11, Salesky discloses at least one exhibitor client is a plurality of exhibitor clients (col 8, lines 30-35, presenter and attendee client, conference listing).

19. As per claim 12, Salesky discloses step of storing cross-referencing fields from the convention content information in a relational database to allow an unlimited number of exhibitor clients (col 29, lines 34-41 and col 30, lines 15-30).

20. As per claim 13, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website from the meeting planner client session content information (14,17, fig 2, col 8, lines 45-54).

21. As per claim 14, Salesky discloses the steps of receiving at the central website a request for certain client session content information from the attendee client for and releasing to the attendee client information satisfying the search request (14,17, fig 2, col 8, lines 45-54).

22. As per claim 15, Salesky discloses the session content information is cyber-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).

23. As per claim 16, Salesky discloses the session content information is one of either cyber-based or venue-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).

24. As per claim 17, Salesky discloses the step of providing attendee client participation in the session (fig 8B, col 8, lines 55-57).
25. As per claim 18, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website a search request from the attendee client for session information and releasing to the attendee client such information (14,17, fig 2, col 8, lines 30-35).
26. As per claim 19, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central websites from the attendee client information necessary to register for the session (14,17, fig 2, col 8, lines 30-37, finding or being told).
27. As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Salesky discloses exhibit booth design (66, 68, fig 3, col 11, lines 13-18, and lines 55-59, booths are created by graphics).
28. As per claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4, and 20 above.
29. As per claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 20 above.

30. As per claim 23-27, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 20, above.
31. As per claim 28, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website from the meeting planner paper presentation content information (col 7, lines -17, lecture).
32. As per claim 29, Salesky discloses the paper presentation content information is cyber-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).
33. As per claim 30, Salesky discloses the paper presentation content information is one of either cyber-based or venue-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).
34. As per claim 31, Salesky discloses the step of releasing to the attendee client paper presentation content information (col 7, lines -17, lecture).
35. As per claim 32, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website from the meeting planner meeting proceedings content information (col 7, lines -17, lecture).

36. As per claim 33, Salesky discloses the meeting proceedings content information is cyber-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).
37. As per claim 34, Salesky discloses the meeting proceedings content information is one of either cyber-based or venue-based (col 8, line 39, WWW browser).
38. As per claim 35, Salesky discloses the step of releasing to the attendee client meeting proceedings content information (col 8, lines 30-35, presenter and attendee client, conference listing).
39. As per claim 36, Salesky discloses the step of receiving at the central website from the meeting planner cyber broadcast content information (col 7, lines 15-20).
40. As per claim 37, Salesky discloses the step of releasing to the attendee client cyber broadcast content information (col 7, lines 10-20).
41. As per claim 38, Salesky discloses a plurality of conventions are facilitated from the central website (14,17, fig 2, col 8, lines 30-40).

42. As per claim 39, Salesky discloses the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Salesky teaches c) receiving at the central website from the attendee client information necessary to register for the convention (col 8, lines 30-35, setup is performed via WWW)

43. As per claim 40, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

44. As per claim 41, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10, above.

45. As per claim 42, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20, above.

Response to Arguments

46. Applicant's arguments filed 07/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-42 is maintained.

47. Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the

teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

48. In the remarks applicants argued that:

Argument: Salesky does not disclose the application service provider or ASP model.

Response: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Salesky in fig 1 shows a software architecture, third party entity (conference server 14), hosts and manages access to a conference and facilitates exchange between presenter and attendee.

Argument: Salesky does not disclose receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions.

Response: Salesky discloses receiving (col 29, lines 62-63), from the at least one meeting planner client (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24), and electronically storing (16, fig 1, col 30 lines 20-21, Meeting DB) at a central website (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24), convention content (meeting content, col 24, lines 66-67) information for a plurality of conventions (col 29, lines 34-37, conventions is interpreted as several meetings). It is noted that in the previous action 09/22/2005 the typographical error "does not disclose" was made.

Argument: Salesky does not disclose receiving from an attendee client at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions.

Response: Salesky discloses receiving at the central website (conference server, 14, fig 2) from the at least one attendee client (a conferee client, 17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (conferee locates a conference listing, col 8, lines 34-45).

Argument: Salesky does not disclose convention content.

Response: Salesky discloses convention content (meeting content, col 24, lines 66-67).

Argument: Salesky does not disclose electronically storing (16, fig 1, col 30 lines 20-21, Meeting DB).

Response: Salesky discloses electronically storing (16, fig 1, col 30 lines 20-21, Meeting DB).

Argument: Salesky does not disclose releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Response: Salesky discloses releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information (17,14, fig 2, col 8, lines 35-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference).

49. In response to applicant's argument that Internet-based application service provider ("ASP") or hosted systems that would permit meeting planers or tradeshow organizers to organize virtual conventions, a recitation

of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

50. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

51. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Conclusion

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose

telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100